



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

JUL 14 2004

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Jerome D. Jackson (Jackson Patent Law Office)
211 N. Union Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314

In re application of : **DECISION ON PETITION**
Ken R. Powell : **TO MAKE SPECIAL**
Application No. 10/670,297 : **(INFRINGEMENT)**
Filed: September 26, 2003 :
For: **SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTING**
COUPONS THROUGH A SYSTEM OF COMPUTER NETWORKS

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d) filed February 23, 2004 to make the above-identified application special. The petition requests that the above-identified application be made special under the procedure set forth in M.P.E.P. § 708.02, item II: Infringement.

MPEP 708.02 states that a Petition to Make Special based on Infringement must have the following: (1) the appropriate petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i); (2) a statement by the assignee, applicant, or attorney alleging: (A) that there is an infringing device or product actually on the market or method in use; (B) that a rigid comparison of the alleged infringing device, product or method with the claims of the application has been made, and that, in his or her opinion, some of the claims are unquestionably infringed; and (C) that he or she has made a careful and thorough search of the prior art, or has good knowledge of the prior art, and has sent a copy of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims.

The petition filed December 29, 2003 lacks requirement 2(C) above. In view of this deficiency, the petition is **DISMISSED**.

The applicant, assignee or attorney in addition to stating that a careful search of the prior art has been made, or having good knowledge of the prior art, **must** submit the **most closely** related pieces of prior art. Since "most closely related" is the **best** of the art found, a submission of art is always required, even if the applicant feels that it is not all that related to the invention. Applicant's statement that the known references most closely related are already of record having been cited or submitted to the USPTO in prior applications does not meet the requirement of having sent a copy of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims since it is not clear exactly which references and which applications applicant is referring to.

Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. Should petitioner desire reconsideration, he should supplement this petition by a declaration or statement giving the information as outlined above.

Applicant should promptly submit a renewed petition to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. The envelope should indicate that the correspondence be brought to the attention of Technology Center 3600.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.

SUMMARY: Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.



Steven N. Meyers
Special Programs Examiner
Technology Center 3600
(703) 308-3868

SNM/vdb: 7/8/04